

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA



California Judicial Branch

In California, as in the U.S. government, the power to govern is divided among three branches—legislative, executive, and judicial. The California court system, the nation's largest, serves over 34 million people with more than 2,000 judicial officers and over 21,000 court employees working in 460 court locations around the state.

The Courts

California Supreme Court

- 1 Chief Justice, 6 associate justices;
- Hears oral arguments in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Sacramento;
- Has discretionary authority to review decisions of the Courts of Appeal and direct responsibility for automatic appeals after death penalty judgments.

Courts of Appeal

- 105 justices;
- 6 districts, 18 divisions, 9 court locations:
- Review the majority of appealable orders and judgments from the superior courts.

Superior Courts

- 1,498 judges, 431 commissioners and referees;
- 58 courts, one in each county, with from 1 to 55 branches;
- Provide a forum for resolution of criminal and civil cases under state and local laws. State and local laws define crimes, specify punishments, and define civil duties and liabilities.

Branch Administration and Policy

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts

• The Judicial Council is the constitutionally created 27-member policymaking body of the California courts; its staff agency is the Administrative Office of the Courts.

Branch Agencies

Commission on Judicial Performance

 Responsible for the censure, removal, retirement, and private admonishment of judges and commissioners. Decisions subject to review by the California Supreme Court.

Commission on Judicial Appointments

• Confirms gubernatorial appointments to the Supreme Court and appellate courts.

Habeas Corpus Resource Center

 Handles state and federal habeas corpus proceedings in capital cases; provides training and resources for private attorneys who take these cases.

Mission of the Judiciary

The judiciary shall, in a fair, accessible, effective, and efficient manner, resolve disputes arising under the law and shall interpret and apply the law consistently, impartially, and independently to protect the rights and liberties guaranteed by the Constitutions of California and the United States.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

INTRODUCTION ii
I. SEVENTY-FIVE YEARS OF LEADERSHIP
II. THE NEW ERA: STRUCTURAL REFORMS 1 1
III. COUNCIL ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE 15
IV MEMBER ROSTER 1926–2001 25

The Judicial Council is the policymaking body of the California courts, the largest court system in the nation. Under the leadership of the Chief Justice and in accordance with the California Constitution, the council is responsible for ensuring the consistent, independent, impartial, and accessible administration of justice. The Administrative Office of the Courts serves as the staff agency for the council.









William C. Vickrey

We are pleased to present this short profile of the Judicial Council, the constitutional policymaking body of the California courts. The booklet provides general information about the organization and structure of the council, as well as its history, accomplishments, goals, and current challenges. Also provided is a roster of members who have served on the council from 1926 to the present.

We welcome your interest in the Judicial Council and the judicial branch of state government and encourage your involvement. It is our mission to ensure the consistent, independent, impartial, and accessible administration of justice for all Californians.

Ronald M. George

Chief Justice of California and Chair of the Judicial Council William C. Vickrey

Administrative Director of the Courts

I. Seventy-five Years of Leadership

Judicial Council Assumes Mantle of Leadership: 1926–1940 In 1926 California joined a nationwide court reform movement that encouraged the establishment of judicial councils to bring coherence to court operations and procedures and improve the quality of justice. The public seemed ready for such a change in its 75-year-old court system.

The voters' pamphlet that year observed that

"the work of the various courts is not correlated, and nobody is responsible for seeing that the machinery of the courts is working smoothly." Advocating for a constitutional amendment to create the policymaking body, the pamphlet noted that, under the present system, "when it is discovered that some rule of procedure is not working well, it is nobody's business to see that the evil is corrected." A judicial council, the pamphlet's authors promised, would ensure that, "whenever anything goes wrong, any judge or lawyer or litigant or other citizen will know to whom to make complaint, and it will be the duty of the council to propose a remedy, and if this cannot be done without an amendment to the laws, the council will recommend to the Legislature any change in the law which it deems necessary."

"Respect for the law depends in large part upon the manner in which it is administered, and it is natural that the people look to us, as they have a right to do, for the leadership that can assure them an enlightened judicial system. We must recognize the importance of this trust and that, if we fail, others less qualified will undertake what is primarily our responsibility, perhaps with unfortunate results." — Chief Justice Phil Gibson, State Bar Journal, 1957

In November, voters overwhelmingly agreed. By a vote of more than two to one, Californians approved the amendment creating the Judicial Council as the governing body of the state's third branch, putting into its hands the responsibility for overseeing the administration of justice throughout the state's multitiered and far-flung court system. Since then, the Judicial Council has remained a vital leader of state judicial administration.

EARLY SUCCESS. Although it lacked both facilities and staff, the Judicial Council began California's first survey of superior courts within a month of its inaugural meeting, under the leadership of its first chair, Chief Justice William H. Waste. When the survey revealed that the condition of court business was "dismal," the council recommended close to 50 legislative bills aimed at correcting some of the "evils" that had been identified.

The constitutional amendment creating the Judicial Council authorized the Chief Justice to assign judges from less encumbered courts to those carrying the heaviest caseloads, to "equalize the work of all judges." This practice provided only a temporary solution to a growing problem, however. Three reforms during this period helped ease court workload pressures: the establishment of the Fourth District of the Court of Appeal, the creation of new trial court judgeships, and the expansion of the jurisdictions of some lower courts. Encouraged by these early milestones, courts and the Legislature worked together over the following decades to adopt a continuing series of reforms.



"[With the creation of the Judicial Council in 1926.1 California gave notice to the world that this commonwealth no longer would tolerate antiquated, 'go-as-you-please' methods in the operation of its courts, but instead, would insist upon establishing business efficiency and economy in its judicial system." — Second Report of the Judicial Council of California to the Governor and the Legislature

Court
Administration
Comes of Age:
1940–1964

From the eve of World War II to 1962, California became the most populous state in the nation, with its number of residents more than doubling from 9 million to 22 million. Presiding over the court system during this time of rapid change was Supreme Court Justice Phil S. Gibson, who became the Judicial

Council's second chair in June 1940. For the next 25 years, this respected jurist established the council as an initiator of solutions and led an overhaul and modernization of the state's court system.

Under the Gibson administration, the council recommended constitutional amendments and statutes that led to, among other things, the Commission on Judicial Qualifications (later named the Commission on Judicial Performance), an organization responsible for the censure, removal, retirement,

and private admonishment of judges and commissioners; the establishment of the Fifth Appellate District, based in Fresno; uniform procedures for juvenile courts; adoption of standard procedures for appeal in justice court and small claims cases; and authorization to use retired judges, through the assigned judges program, to assist courts with heavy caseloads.

TURNING POINTS. Two initiatives dominated the land-scape in the postwar era. The first occurred in 1950, a year after a Judicial Council study revealed the existence of 767 courts of six different types below the superior court level. The council consolidated the six types into only two—municipal courts and justice courts—with uniform judicial qualifications, salaries, and provisions for financial support. This move not only improved public service and the quality of justice, but it also laid the foundation for further reorganization measures during the following decades, which culminated almost half a century later in the complete unification of 220 municipal and superior courts into 58 superior courts, one in each county.

Chief Justice Gibson also is credited with a second initiative—the creation of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). Until that time, the Judicial Council had functioned without a dedicated staff. Its work was performed by council members aided by staff of the Supreme Court. A 1960 amendment to article VI of the California Constitution created the position of Administrative Director of the Courts, and the following year the Legislature granted resources for the establishment of the AOC. The council appointed the nationally respected Ralph N.

"Creation of an Administrative Office of the Courts means that there is now an administrative arm for the council, through which continuous and effective action can be taken to carry out policies adopted by the council. Its work in the field of legal and statistical research will continue, and at an increased tempo, but these efforts will be followed by staff action to implement both the rules and policies adopted by the council for the improvement of judicial administration and statutes adopted by the Legislature in that field." -Ralph N. Kleps, first Administrative Director of the Courts

Kleps as the AOC's first director (see profile on page 31).

The establishment of the AOC was a turning point in Judicial Council

The establishment of the AOC was a turning point in Judicial Council history. At last the council had the resources to conduct ongoing court improvement programs. It meant, said Mr. Kleps, that now the council had an administrative arm, through which continuous and effective action could be taken to improve court administration at an increased tempo.

Soon after its creation, the AOC began to assume an operational role, acquiring new responsibilities that promoted greater flexibility and efficiency in the judicial system. In 1965 the state's Department of Finance transferred to the AOC all fiscal support services for the Judicial Council, the appellate courts, and other state judicial agencies. Five years later, legislation gave the Judicial Council the authority to allocate state funds for its own support and that of the appellate courts. The council delegated that authority to the Administrative Director of the Courts, who acted with the approval of the Chief Justice. That same year, the chair of the council was given salary-setting authority for employees of the state-level courts and judicial agencies. In response to these new duties, the AOC established staffs to handle personnel, fiscal, accounting, and data processing duties. The agency's role continued to expand. By the end of the century it encompassed a broad range of services to some 20,000 judicial branch staff members of 75 trial and appellate courts in 460 court locations.



The AOC's declared mission was to serve the council and the courts to the benefit of all Californians "by advancing leadership and excellence in the administration of justice." As the century came to an end, the AOC had fulfilled this duty with distinction, having evolved into one of the nation's most respected and innovative agents for court reform.

Transforming the Judicial Branch: 1964–1986 For the next 22 years, the Judicial Council oversaw a renaissance in judicial administration

under the leadership of Chief Justices Roger J. Traynor (1964–1970), Donald R. Wright (1970–1977), and Rose Elizabeth Bird (1977–1986). Indeed, many of the most sweeping

court reforms in state history took root in this era. Rules of court practice and procedure were refined. The council defined the use of cameras in the court-room, developed an initial system for identifying judgeship needs, reformed the appellate court system, and assumed a major role in family law when California, with the Family Law Act, became the first state to endorse no-fault divorce.

By developing and adopting these new programs and by enhancing established practices, the judiciary was able to adapt to the state's unique social and economic changes, which included unprecedented population growth and diversity. It was during this era that the council began to grapple with policy

decisions that went beyond procedure and rules. Particularly by the 1980s, its focus had turned to issues of governance, the role of the judiciary, and strategic planning.

STRUCTURAL TRANSFORMATION. The trial court reorganization of 1950, while increasing administrative efficiency and economy, did not completely alleviate caseload problems. In the early 1970s, the Judicial Council continued to explore the feasibility of a completely unified trial court system. Eventually it merged the municipal and justice courts into a single municipal court. The goal of unification with the superior courts remained a top priority for the next two decades.

1985 TRIAL COURT FUNDING ACT. In her 1983 State of the Judiciary address, Chief Justice Bird outlined principles for state funding of the California trial courts.

In the Gibson era, the Judicial Council developed efficient procedures to solve the problems caused by the increasing legal complexity of California's more than 100 administrative agencies. The council was lauded nationwide for the creation of the Department of Administrative Procedure, the Administrative Procedure Act, and standards for judicial review of administrative action. Other states adopted similar reforms.

Those principles were incorporated into the 1985 Trial Court Funding Act, under which the trial courts were to be recognized as part of a single state court system and funded by the state. Up to that time, the trial courts—unlike the appellate courts, which historically were state funded—had depended heavily on county revenues. This dependency had caused widespread uncertainties and disparities among the courts and made long-range planning impossible. The 1985 law was heralded even though no actual funds were appropriated to implement it. Undeterred, the council continued to work toward the goal of full trial court funding throughout the next decade. Success was at last achieved in 1997 (see page 11).

EDUCATION. One of the most significant developments in the 1970s was the establishment of the California Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) by the California Judges Association and the Judicial Council. It was the most extensive program of its kind in the United States at that time and remains a world leader in judicial education today. In 1994 CJER merged with the AOC's Administrative Education Unit and is now part of the agency's Education Division. It provides ongoing training and education for judges and court employees.

The Age of Planning: 1987–1996 The administration that began in 1987, when Chief Justice Malcolm M. Lucas took the helm, opened an epoch marked by quantitative and qualitative reforms. Realizing that the judiciary must speak with a unified voice to be effective as an independent

branch of government, the council made a deep assessment of California's court system. Great strides were made in reducing trial court delays as well as in the council's historic goal of trial court unification and funding. Far-reaching court technology changes were set in motion. But protecting judicial independence was at the center of this mission, as was the goal of optimizing local trial court control. In particular, the Lucas administration was marked by the advent of long-range strategic planning. Finally, landmark studies on fairness in the courts elevated the improvement of court access to the status of a guiding principle for the council.

TRIAL COURT IMPROVEMENT. In 1987 a fundamental shift in California's case management policy began with the implementation of the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act, designed to reduce case processing time. The 1988 Brown-Presley Trial Court Funding Act signaled that California had finally accepted partial funding responsibility for its trial courts.

"We need to anticipate change and plan for action. We need to lead and not wait to be led into the next millennium." —Chief
Justice Malcolm M. Lucas

Three years later, the Trial Court Realignment and Efficiency Act increased state funding in exchange for reforms, among them the adoption of trial court coordination. In 1992, while the counties remained the primary source of trial court funding, the council created a special commission to oversee trial court budget submissions to the Legislature and allocate state funds, a function that clearly established the judiciary as an equal branch of government. The council also outlined standards that trial courts would use "for purposes of internal evaluation, self-assessment, and self-improvement."

PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE. The year 1992 was the dawn of futures planning. That year the Judicial Council adopted its first Strategic and Reorganization Plan, which set forth five explicit goals. In so doing, the judicial branch was offering assurance that present and future resources would be dedicated to public service improvements.

The year before, the council had brought together a diverse group of representatives of the public, the judiciary, the Legislature, academia, law enforce-

ment agencies, and court administrators to form the Commission on the Future of the California Courts. In a little over two years, this commission carried out the most comprehensive review of the California judiciary in history, offering more than 200 recommendations for reinventing a justice system that would become more accessible and more efficient for a changing California.

In the following years, the council began to implement many of these recommendations. Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) forums emerged; specialty courts for families, drug-related cases, domestic violence, and other case types were established; training for judges and court staffs was enhanced; the number and quality of court interpreters gained significance; and the need to reform the state's jury system was recognized.

ACCESS AND FAIRNESS. Asserting that all Californians should have speedy and ready access to their court system, the Judicial Council during this period made "access and fairness" a permanent guiding principle. In 1987 Chief Justice Lucas, continuing work begun by Chief Justice Bird, created the Advisory Committee on Gender Bias in the Courts. That committee submitted 68 recommendations for reform, which were adopted by the council. This was followed in 1991 by the formation of a special committee on racial and ethnic bias in the courts, which later became the Access and Fairness Advisory Committee. That committee continues to review

In February 1999, the
Judicial Council dedicated
the Malcolm M. Lucas
Board Room and the
Judicial Council Conference
Center in San Francisco.
Located in the Hiram W.
Johnson State Office
Building, the conference
center serves as the headquarters for California's
judicial branch.

and make recommendations about fairness issues in the courts that are related to race, ethnicity, gender, persons with disabilities, and sexual orientation.

The Judicial Council Today

On May 1, 1996, Supreme Court Associate Justice Ronald M. George was sworn in as the 27th Chief Justice of California. Under his leadership, California courts continue to initiate

statewide reforms on an unprecedented scale.

RESTRUCTURING. Chief Justice George renewed the council's vigorous advocacy for trial court funding and unification. He led the courts through dire crises and ultimately to resounding successes with the passage of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and, a year later, Proposition 220, which provided

for voluntary unification of the superior and municipal courts in each county. By 2001, the courts in all 58 counties had voted to unify into single countywide trial court systems. As a result of these two landmark developments, California trial courts, for the first time in their history, can expect funding stability. This achievement, along with the unification of court resources, is essential to an efficient and effective judicial system.



FORGING PARTNERSHIPS. Within one year of assuming office, Chief Justice George visited each of California's 58 counties to meet with local court leaders. His ambitious statewide outreach programs have promoted unity and cooperation between the Judicial Council and the courts and between the executive and legislative branches. As a result, the judiciary entered the new millennium a strong, independent, and co-equal branch that, the Chief Justice says, "stands ready to resolve cases for all who need our assistance, . . . reaches its decisions without hint of prejudice or passion, and . . . accepts responsibility for the management of its own affairs."

PROGRESS CONTINUES. With trial court funding and reorganization firmly in place, Chief Justice George has turned his attention to other urgent issues, examining every aspect of court operations and achieving significant gains in the quality of justice. His administration's reforms have involved every area of court administration, from the creation of specialty courts for drug offenses, domestic violence, the homeless, and the mentally ill to improved access for litigants without attorneys, more coordinated and sophisticated application of technology, revamping of the state's court facilities, and enhanced education for judges and court staffs.

MAJOR REFORMS. Some of the most dramatic improvements have occurred in California's troubled jury system. In 2001 the state's jurors got their first pay raise since 1957, along with a one-day/one-trial rule. Still to come are simplified jury instructions, and a task force has been created to pursue other improvements. The council set up a vigorous program to increase the number of court interpreters. The program has included pay raises to attract and maintain the services of these critically important professionals. In addition, the council is leading efforts to expand and improve court-based programs for California's families and children.

RULES OF COURT. The Judicial Council continues to adopt uniform rules of court in more areas of practice, preempting local rules, so that practitioners, who these days frequently traverse county lines on behalf of clients, can be assured that the practices followed in each county will be the same. In addition, the council recently approved the first major revision of appellate court rules in more than 50 years, to increase their clarity and usefulness.

confidence caused of access."—Chie Ronald M. George world—a system in which challenges arising from social and economic pressures, increased expectations, and the fast pace of change require innovative responses. More than ever before, the Judicial Council must work collaboratively with community, social service, and justice system partners. Chief Justice George is committed to such broad collaboration. Under his leadership, the Judicial Council strives to speak effectively on behalf of the entire branch and to make difficult decisions to ensure that courts throughout

the state are fair and accessible. The underlying goal is to improve public trust and confidence not only in California's justice system but also in our state gov-

"If the motto 'And justice for all' becomes 'And justice for those who can afford it,' we threaten the very underpinnings of our social contract. And every day, the administration of justice in our state is threatened by the erosion of public confidence caused by lack of access." —Chief Justice Ronald M. George

Reform Engineer

ernment as a whole.

In the leadership of Chief Justice Ronald M. George "the Judicial Branch has lots to celebrate," wrote the Los Angeles Daily Journal (October 2, 2000). "In short order, George has secured stable funding for trial courts, some of which were on the verge of bankruptcy when he took over. He has presided over a merger of county municipal and superior courts that is expected to make the trial courts more efficient and save taxpayers millions of dollars. He has helped revamp the capital appellate process to make it speedier, and he has recast jury duty to make it more citizen-friendly."

The publication also noted other successes, such as pay raises for California's jurors and judges, the addition of a dozen new appellate judgeships, and funding for court technology, court interpreters, and court-based programs for families and children. "To hear it from advocates and lawmakers alike, much of the credit goes to Ronald M. George....The leader of the state's court system has made his mark as a masterful engineer of reform the likes of which California has not seen since 1964, when Chief Justice Phil Gibson retired."

II. The New Era: Structural Reforms

The judicial branch entered the 21st century strengthened by two long-sought reforms: state funding of the trial courts and trial court unification. These structural changes have produced more extensive and more rapid public service advances than have been seen at any other time in state history.

State Funding

Key legislation during the 1980s succeeded in increasing the state's share of responsibility for trial court funding under a system in which trial courts were subjected to two separate budget

processes at the county and state levels. The landmark Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 did away with that bifurcated system. The act gave the state full responsibility for trial court funding and charged the Judicial Council with overseeing the process and developing a budget structure that assesses court performance. The court budget process is tied both to the priorities outlined in the council's strategic plan and to local court strategic plans. Overall, trial court funding accomplishes three historic goals of the judicial branch by:

- Providing a stable and adequate funding source for trial courts;
- Allowing policy and planning to drive the budget process and thus improve fiscal responsibility and accountability; and
- Enhancing equal access to justice by removing disparities caused by the varying abilities of individual counties to address the operating needs of the courts and to provide basic and constitutionally mandated services.

Trial Court Unification The second fundamental structural change for the judicial branch was the voluntary unification of the superior and municipal courts into a single level of trial court, made possible by

Proposition 220, otherwise known as Senate Constitutional Amendment 4, which voters overwhelmingly approved in 1998. This amendment abolished the municipal level of courts and merged the municipal courts' officers, employees, facilities, records, and pending matters with those of the unified superior court unless otherwise provided by statute.

Recent
Accomplishments

Trial court funding and unification were the crown jewels of the Judicial Council's long reformation movement, but in recent years the court system has brought about many other innovative

reforms related to the council's strategic goals. Some of the highlights follow.

INDEPENDENCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY. To serve the overall interests of the judicial branch, the Judicial Council has refined strategic planning, linking its own plan to the local courts' individual community-focused strategic plans. A task force is overseeing efforts to institutionalize community outreach programs in the courts. The council also has aligned the trial court budget process more closely with that of its sister branches and has developed an objective process for determining the numbers of judicial officers needed in the trial courts. In addition, concern for preserving the high quality of the California judiciary led the Chief Justice to create a task force to study judicial service, retention, and compensation.

Access, Fairness, and Diversity. Improving access for all Californians, including those who are economically disadvantaged, is a major goal of the Judicial Council. At the urging of Chief Justice George and the State Bar, the state has allocated \$10 million for legal services to the poor. The council created an online self-help center for litigants who go to court without attorneys and for others needing basic information. A task force was created to study other ways of helping self-represented litigants.

Additional activities include the creation of specialty courts to improve court access in cases involving youth, domestic violence, the mentally ill, veterans, and the homeless. The council is leading programs to improve access for

non-English speakers and expand educational programs for judges and court staffs on diversity and cultural competence, gender fairness, sexual orientation fairness, and barriers to access and fairness for persons with disabilities. Its Access and Fairness Advisory Committee is developing a second demographic survey of the court system, evaluating the status of the courts' local fairness committees, and developing a benchguide about Native American legal issues.

MODERNIZATION OF MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION.

The Judicial Council has approved the first major revision in California's appellate court rules in more than a century. In the trial court area, the council set up a Complex Civil Litigation Pilot Program in six courts to test methods of increasing case processing speed and efficiency. Other trial courts are testing pilot programs to assess the benefits of early mediation in civil cases. In addition, by creating uniform rules in several key areas, the council has effected statewide uniformity in court procedures.

QUALITY OF JUSTICE. The AOC established the Center for Families, Children & the Courts, which has gained national recognition for its innovative programs for handling the problems of special constituencies. The quality of justice has been improved by recent efforts to make jury service less burdensome. The council raised jurors' pay and is advocating for additional raises. Another key achievement was the recently implemented one-day/one-trial jury selection system. And soon the instructions for jurors will be rewritten in language that is easier to understand.

EDUCATION. CJER is expanding professional development opportunities for California's judges and court employees by using distance education technologies, including satellite broadcasts. In addition, new curricula are being developed to enhance the knowledge of judicial officers and court staffs in areas of major current interest.

TECHNOLOGY. Automation is making courts more efficient and accessible. The council has adopted the branch's first statewide technology coordination plan and is developing a telecommunications infrastructure to connect the justice community. A new system for automated statistical reporting and warehousing of caseload data was developed. Moreover, courts are using the Internet to provide unprecedented public access to court information. Projects are under

way to permit e-filing in trial courts, and measures are being aimed specifically at easing the burdens of complex litigation. Appellate courts now provide online access to information about their cases and can furnish automatic notification to counsel and the parties concerning significant events in a particular case.

Improving public access and fairness through technological advances, court services and procedures, and judicial and administrative education remains an ongoing challenge in a society where social and economic changes continue to make new demands on the courts. In the near term, the council is considering a recommendation that the state assume full financial responsibility for 460 court facilities in California, a significant number of which need repair, renovation, or maintenance. The council also is eager to develop integrated court technology systems that will allow coordination among courts, law enforcement agencies, and other parts of the justice system.

THE EXPANDING ROLE OF THE AOC. When the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) was created in 1960, its primary duty was to provide staff support to the Judicial Council in carrying out its constitutional responsibilities. Over the last four decades that role has grown dramatically. In particular, the 1990s saw quantum leaps in the administration of justice, which greatly expanded the AOC's responsibilities.

Today, the agency's role is one of leadership, knowledge, and service to the judicial branch and the public. Its duties encompass statewide fiscal policy and planning, legal services, technology development, human resources management, judicial education, improved court services for families and children, statewide research and planning, and an array of other programs to improve a variety of court administration areas, such as jury service, court facilities, and court-community collaboration. Toward these efforts, the AOC works with some 30 Judicial Council advisory committees and task forces comprising more than 600 representatives from the courts and the bar. Together they help the council shape policies and create programs to meet the challenges of California courts in the 21st century.

III. Council Organization and Structure

The authorization for the Judicial Council is contained in article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution, which also specifies the council's membership (along with terms of office) and functions. Amendments to that section between 1960 and 1966 broadened the membership and authorized the establishment of the AOC. Rules 6.1–6.70 of the California Rules of Court contain the council's mission statement, guiding principles, and nominating procedures and describe the function and duties of each of the council's committees.

The 27 members of the council include the following:

- * The Chief Justice of California, who serves as the council's chair;
- 14 judges appointed by the Chief Justice;
- 4 attorney members appointed by the State Bar Board of Governors;
- 1 member from each house of the California Legislature;
- 6 advisory members, including court executives; and
- The Administrative Director of the Courts, who serves as secretary.



Members of the council are selected by a nominating procedure designed to attract applicants from throughout the legal system with diverse backgrounds, experiences, and geographic locations.

The council's Executive and Planning Committee publicizes the vacancies and solicits nominations and applications. For each position except the Supreme Court

associate justice position, it selects nominees from the names submitted to the Chief Justice. The committee gives added consideration to persons who have served on Judicial Council advisory committees or task forces. The Chief Justice makes appointments to the council by order.

Terms are staggered, with one-third of the council's membership changing each year. This ensures continuity while creating opportunities for new participation and input. The council members serve without compensation except for reimbursement of travel and lodging expenditures.

The Judicial Council has constitutional responsibility to survey judicial business; study the operation of the courts; adopt rules not inconsistent with statute in the areas of court administration, practice, and procedure; and make recommendations to the courts, the Governor, and the Legislature.

The council also has responsibility for:

- Establishing direction and setting priorities for the continual improvement of the court system;
- Sponsoring and taking positions on legislation that affects the California judicial system;
- Approving budgets for the California judicial branch; and
- Responding to appropriate mandates from the Legislature.

The Judicial Council's vision for the California court system is defined in its strategic plan, *Leading Justice Into the Future*. The plan outlines six goals and detailed action plans for the council's

committees and the AOC. The Judicial Council's six goals are to improve:

- 1. Access, fairness, and diversity;
- 2. Independence and accountability;
- 3. Modernization of management and administration;
- 4. Quality of justice and service to the public;
- 5. Education; and
- 6. Technology.

The plan was developed with input from judges and court administrators from across the state as well as representatives of the State Bar, the Legislature, the executive branch, and the public. At the state level, the Judicial Council is responsible for adopting policies, court rules, standards of judicial administration, and budget and management regulations; proposing legislation; and conducting studies. At the local level, courts are asked to develop plans that support the statewide goals and respond to the special needs of their communities.

Meetings and Procedures In 1992 the Judicial Council reorganized its operating procedures and committees to increase participation in council activities and better fulfill its role as a deliberative policymaking body

and a cohesive, effective voice with other branches of government. The Judicial Council holds six to eight two-day meetings a year. A majority of council members must be present at each business meeting for the council to take action. Between meetings, the council may use a circulating order to take action on items requiring immediate consideration.

The council's Executive and Planning Committee coordinates the annual schedule and establishes agendas for council meetings. The AOC posts meeting notices and agendas on the California Courts Web site at www.courtinfo.ca.gov. All items on the council's agenda are classified as consent, discussion, or informational items. consent items are noncontroversial items that require council action and do not require presentation or discussion. They are handled as a group in the business meeting and are approved by the council without discussion. A consent item can be moved to the discussion agenda in response to a request from a council member. Discussion items may or may not require

council action. They do require time on the agenda for presentation and discussion. Items are placed on the discussion agenda if they are noteworthy, complex, or controversial. *Informational items* do not require presentation, discussion time, or council action and are presented solely in written form at the meeting.



OPEN MEETING POLICY. The council's business meetings are open to the public. Discussions of litigation, personnel matters, contract or legislative negotiations, the purchase or sale of real estate, security plans or procedures, and allegations of criminal or professional misconduct ordinarily take place in closed session.

Members of the public who wish to speak at a business meeting must submit a request of no more than two pages to the chair of the Executive and Planning Committee by delivering it to the AOC at least four business days before the meeting. The contents of such a request are outlined in rule 6.6(d) of the California Rules of Court. The Executive and Planning Committee must respond to the request at least two business days before the meeting.

Public access to meetings at which county trial court system budgets are discussed is described in rule 6.702(h) of the California Rules of Court.

CAMERAS. Business meetings may be photographed, recorded, or broadcast at the discretion of the Chief Justice. A request to do so must be received by the Chief Justice at least two business days before the meeting.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OUTREACH. Council members regularly report in writing to all judges and court administrators on the actions taken at council business meetings. They also write columns on key meeting topics for *Court News*, the award-winning bimonthly newsletter published by the AOC for judges and court staffs.

In addition to these outreach efforts, the Judicial Council maintains vigorous communications with courts, the other branches of state government, and agencies and organizations that work with the courts, such as the Department of Justice, Department of Corrections, Department of Motor Vehicles, Department of Social Services, District Attorneys' Association, State Public Defender, California Family Support Council, and State Bar.

Internal Committees Under the Judicial Council's own governance principles, each member of the council is appointed by the Chief Justice to serve on one of four internal committees. These committees consider

matters and then report to the council.

EXECUTIVE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE. Oversees the council's operating procedures and the implementation of its strategic plan—including how the judicial branch budget relates to the plan—and serves as the nominating committee for vacancies on the council and advisory committees.

POLICY COORDINATION AND LIAISON COMMITTEE.

Represents the council in discussions with other government branches and agencies and makes recommendations on relevant issues and legislation.

RULES AND PROJECTS COMMITTEE. Oversees the advisory committees and task forces as well as the development of the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and Judicial Council forms.

LITIGATION MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE. Oversees litigation and claims that seek recovery of \$50,000 or more or raise important policy issues and are initiated against trial court judges, the Judicial Council, the AOC, the trial courts, or the employees of those bodies.

Advisory Committees Judicial Council advisory committees and task forces are established to monitor certain topics or areas of the law and to comment and make recommendations to the council. The Chief

Justice may appoint advisory committees and task forces to advise the council on the condition of business in the courts, how to improve the administration of justice, or how to perform any of its other duties.

The council's nomination process encourages diversity in appointments and ensures the participation of judges, court officials, the general public, representatives of public agencies, and attorneys from throughout the state. Committee members' differing perspectives, expertise, and experiences produce informed and comprehensive responses for council consideration.

The current advisory committees follow.

ACCESS AND FAIRNESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE. Monitors issues related to access to the judicial system and fairness in the state courts, and provides policy direction in these areas. The committee is organized into five subcommittees that address racial and ethnic fairness, sexual orientation fairness, gender fairness, and access for persons with disabilities, as well as education and implementation.

ADMINISTRATIVE PRESIDING JUSTICES ADVISORY

COMMITTEE. Improves appellate court judges' participation in the Judicial Council's decision-making process; reviews rules, forms, studies, and recommendations relating to appellate court administration that are proposed to the Judicial Council; identifies issues of concern to the courts, including legislative issues, that might be addressed by the council or one of its advisory committees or task forces; and increases communication between the council and the appellate courts.

APPELLATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE. Advises the Judicial Council on matters related to appellate procedure, forms, standards, practices, and operations and identifies issues of concern to the appellate courts (including legislative issues) that might be taken up by the council.

CIVIL AND SMALL CLAIMS ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Identifies issues and concerns confronting the judiciary in the areas of civil procedure, practice, and case management (including small claims and ADR) and suggests appropriate solutions and responses.

COLLABORATIVE JUSTICE COURTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Makes recommendations to the council for developing collaborative justice courts; for improving the processing of cases in drug courts, domestic violence courts, youth courts, and other treatment courts; and for overseeing the evaluation of drug courts throughout the state.

COURT EXECUTIVES ADVISORY COMMITTEE. Improves court administrators' access to and participation in the Judicial Council's decision-making process; reviews rules, forms, standards, studies, and recommendations related to court administration that are proposed to the council by advisory committees or task forces; identifies issues of concern to the courts, including legislative issues, that might be taken up by the Judicial Council or one of its

advisory committees or task forces; and increases communication between the council and the trial courts.

COURT INTERPRETERS ADVISORY PANEL. Works to improve the number and quality of interpreters in the courts and proposes comprehensive legislation and training for interpreters.

COURT TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE. Promotes, coordinates, and facilitates the application of technology to the work of the courts. The committee is charged with recommending standards to ensure technological compatibility; facilitating court technology projects funded in whole or in part by the state; proposing rules, standards, or legislation to ensure privacy, access, and security; and assisting courts in acquiring and developing useful technology systems.

CRIMINAL LAW ADVISORY COMMITTEE. Identifies issues and concerns confronting the judiciary in the areas of criminal procedure, practice, and case management, and suggests solutions and responses.

FAMILY AND JUVENILE LAW ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Identifies issues and concerns confronting the judiciary in the areas of procedure, practice, and management for cases involving families, children, and individuals, and suggests solutions and responses.

GOVERNING COMMITTEE OF THE CENTER FOR JUDICIAL EDUCATION AND RESEARCH (CJER). Makes recommendations to the Judicial Council for improving the administration of justice through education and training for judicial officers and other judicial branch personnel.

JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Provides expert assistance to the council in the development of and advocacy for the judicial branch budget.

PROBATE AND MENTAL HEALTH ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Makes recommendations to the council for improving the administration of justice in proceedings involving (1) decedents' estates, trusts, conservatorships, guardianships, and other probate matters and (2) people with mental health developmental disabilities.

TRAFFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE. Works to improve the administration of justice in the area of traffic and bail-forfeitable offense adjudication; identifies policy issues and recommends rules and/or model procedures that will result in more consistent handling of traffic and bail-forfeitable offenses across the state; and provides analysis in support of policy decisions made by the Judicial Council and the Legislature regarding traffic and bail-forfeitable offense matters.



TRIAL COURT PRESIDING JUDGES ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Improves trial court judges' access to and participation in the Judicial Council's decision-making process; reviews rules, forms, studies, and recommendations related to court administration that are proposed to the council; identifies issues of concern to the courts, including legislative issues, that might be addressed by the council or one of its advisory committees or task forces; and enhances council-court communications.

Task Forces

Proposals and major issues that do not fall within the purview of advisory committees may be referred to a task force. Task forces may be established by the chair of the Judicial Council,

the Administrative Director of the Courts, or the council itself. They report to an advisory committee or an internal council committee, which in turn makes a recommendation to the full council. Current and recent task forces are:

- Ad Hoc Task Force on the Superior Court Appellate Divisions
- Appellate Indigent Defense Oversight Advisory Committee
- Community-Focused Court Planning Implementation Committee
- * Executive Legislative Action Network
- Legal Services Trust Fund Commission
- * Task Force on Appellate Mediation
- * Task Force on the Appellate Process
- Task Force on Court Facilities
- * Task Force on Judicial Service

- * Task Force on Jury Instructions
- * Task Force on Jury System Improvements
- * Task Force on Probation Services
- * Task Force on Self-Represented Litigants

Administrative
Office of the
Courts

In 1961, pursuant to a 1960 constitutional amendment sponsored by the State Bar and the Judicial Council, the office of the Administrative Director of the Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts were established. The council created the

AOC by adopting a resolution that is now embodied in rule 1071 of the California Rules of Court (see "The Expanding Role of the AOC," page 14).

The AOC, the council's staff agency, carries out the official actions of the Judicial Council under the supervision of the Administrative Director of the Courts. The AOC is structured to provide (1) professional services to the courts and the council, including programs to implement trial court funding and unification, and legal services, including litigation management; (2) an array of programs to improve justice administration, such as court services for children and families, court-community collaboration, and the complex litigation program; and (3) programs to enhance court technology, judicial branch education, and human resources support.

More Than a Court Administrator

As the director of the Administrative Office of the Courts, "William Vickrey has an evangelical fervor about reforming California's judicial system," noted the *Daily Journal* (January 31, 1997)—meaning a devotion "to making the judicial system responsive to the changing needs of the public and giving judges the opportunity to treat individual cases individually." Lawmakers, judges, and others quoted in the article describe Mr. Vickrey as "bright, energetic, and a dynamo of ideas," "a person

of high ideals and values," and someone with a "willingness to involve everyone in the process." Regarding himself Mr. Vickrey reflected: "I sit in the most enviable position in the nation. I am very lucky to be here." In 1995 the National Center for State Courts described him as the "quintessential public servant" and recognized his progressive approach to court administration by presenting him with its Warren E. Burger Award.

In addition, two regional offices, one based in the northern part of the state and the other in the southern part, work to improve, facilitate, and increase communication among the trial and appellate courts through a primary focus on operations and by gaining consensus on policy issues.

IV. Member Roster 1926 - 2001

Following is a chronological roster of all the people who have served on the Judicial Council since it was established in 1926. The roster is displayed in the Judicial Council Conference Center in San Francisco, the headquarters of California's judicial branch.

*Hon. William H. Waste, 1926–1940 Chief Justice of California, Chair of the Judicial Council

Mr. B. Grant Taylor, 1926—1942 Clerk of the Supreme Court, Secretary of the Judicial Council

Hon. John W. Shenk, 1926–1959 *Associate Justice, Supreme Court*

Hon. John F.Tyler, 1926–1934

Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District,
Division One, San Francisco

Hon. N. P. Conrey, 1926—1935 Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division One, Los Angeles Hon. William M. Finch, 1926–1930
Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District,
Sacramento

Hon. T. W. Harris, 1926–1942 Judge, Superior Court, Alameda County

Hon. Peter J. Shields, 1926–1934

Judge, Superior Court, Sacramento County

Hon. Walter Perry Johnson, 1926–1938 Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Hon. Harry A. Hollzer, 1926—1931 Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Henry M. Willis, 1926–1930 Presiding Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

William H. Waste 1926-1940

William Harrison Waste was a native son of California, born in 1868 to pioneer immigrants in Butte County.

In the early 1880s, as a student at Los Angeles High School, William H. Waste spent his spare time watching local courtroom proceedings, following the progress of his favorite trial lawyers. By the time he was admitted to the bar at 25, he had witnessed the courts' evolution away from the extremes of pioneer justice that had existed when he was born, and he understood the need for change as the courts progressed into a new era.

When the Judicial Council was authorized in 1926, delay and congestion of litigation were

a problem throughout the state, most notably in Los Angeles County, where a mere 28 judges presided over a superior court in which the

average period between joining of issue and trial of cases was 16 to 18 months. Under the direction of Chief Justice Waste as the first chair of the Judicial Council, and through a statewide mobilization of "judicial man-power," that delay was soon reduced to 3 months.

Chief Justice Waste chaired the Judicial Council for 14 years, from its inception until 1940.

Hon.W. Cloyd Snyder, 1926–1940 Justice of the Peace and Judge of the City Court, South Pasadena

Hon. Victor R. McLucas, 1931–1932 Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Charles R. Barnard, 1932—1946

Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District,
France

Hon. Frank M. Smith, 1932—1942 Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Alden Ames, 1932–1942

Judge, Municipal Court, San Francisco County

Hon. John F. Pullen, 1934–1940
Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District,
Sacramento

Hon. Hilliard Comstock, 1934–1942 Judge, Superior Court, Sonoma County

Hon. Frederick W. Houser, 1935–1937 Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division One, Los Angeles

Hon. John T. Nourse, 1937—1946 Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Two, San Francisco

Hon. Elmer E. Robinson, 1938–1942

Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

*Hon. Phil S. Gibson, 1940–1964 Chief Justice of California, Chair of the Judicial Council

Hon. B. Rey Schauer, 1940—1942 Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, Los Angeles

Hon. H. Leonard Kaufman, 1940–1942

Justice of the Peace, Compton Township, Los Angeles County

Hon. John T. York, 1944–1946 Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division One, Los Angeles

Hon. Maurice T. Dooling, Jr., 1944—1946 Judge, Superior Court, San Benito County

Hon. C. J. Goodell, 1944–1946 *Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County*

Hon. Dal M. Lemmon, 1944—1946 Judge, Superior Court, Sacramento County Hon. Hartley Shaw, 1944–1946

Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Lucius P. Green, 1944—1946

Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. D. Oliver Germino, 1944—1946 *Justice of the Peace, Merced County*

Mr. A. V. Haskell, 1944

Clerk of the Supreme Court, Secretary of the Judicial Council

Hon. Thomas M. Foley, 1946

Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Hon. Andrew R. Schottky, 1946

Judge, Superior Court, Mariposa County

Mr. William I. Sullivan, 1946–1970 Clerk of the Supreme Court, Secretary of the Judicial Council

Hon. Raymond E. Peters, 1948—1950

Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District,
Division One. San Francisco

Hon. Marshall F. McComb, 1948–1950 Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Two. Los Anaeles

Hon. Paul Peek, 1948–1950 Justice, Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Sacramento

Hon.W.Turney Fox, 1948—1950 Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. O. D. Hamlin, Jr., 1948–1950

Judae, Superior Court, Alameda County

Hon. Benjamin C. Jones, 1948—1950 Judge, Superior Court, Lake County

Hon. O. K. Morton, 1948—1950 Judge, Superior Court, Riverside County

Hon. Clarence W. Morris, 1948–1950 Judge, Municipal Court, San Francisco County

Hon. John L. Webster, 1948–1950 Justice of the Peace, Los Angeles County

Hon. A. F. Bray, 1953–1959

Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division One,
San Francisco

Hon. Paul Vallee, 1953–1954

Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division
Three, Los Angeles

Hon. Lloyd E. Griffin, 1953–1954 Justice, Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, San Bernardino

Hon. Melvyn I. Cronin, 1953-1954 Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Hon. Clarence L. Kincaid, 1953-1959 Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Arthur C. Shepard, 1953-1954 Judge, Superior Court, Fresno County

Hon, L. N. Turrentine, 1953-1954 Judge, Superior Court, San Diego County

Hon. Edward J. Smith, 1953-1954 Judge, Municipal Court, Alameda County

Hon, Arden T. Jensen, 1953-1954 Judge, Justice Court, Santa Barbara County

Hon. Thomas P. White, 1956-1959 Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division One, Los Angeles

Hon. B. F. Van Dyke, 1956–1959 Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Sacramento

Hon. Murray Draper, 1956, 1961–1963 Judge, Superior Court, San Mateo County

Hon. Lilburn Gibson, 1956-1959 Judge, Superior Court, Mendocino County

Hon, Frederick E. Stone, 1956–1959, 1965–1967 Judge, Superior Court, Tulare County Justice, Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District, Fresno

Hon. Edward P. Fogg, 1956 Judge, Municipal Court, San Bernardino County

Hon. O. Benton Worley, 1956 Judge, Justice Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. William T. Sweigert, 1959 Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Hon. John B. McNoble, 1959 Judge, Municipal Court, San Joaquin County

Hon, Charles R. Jameson, 1959 Judge, Justice Court, Yolo County

*Hon. Roger J. Traynor, 1961-1964, 1964-1970 Associate Justice, Supreme Court Chief Justice of California, Chair of the Judicial Council

Phil S. Gibson 1940-1964

When Phil S. Gibson was appointed Chief Justice in 1940, he inherited a backlog of pending cases that he managed to clear away in his first two years.

By 1941, after convincing the state Legislature to transfer court rule-making responsibility to the Judicial Council, he was directing the condensation of court rules into everyday English, having brought Bernard E. Witkin, his clerk for many years, to the council for the task. Chief Justice Gibson also pushed through the Legislature the state's former system of municipal and superior courts, with judges either elected by voters or appointed by the Governor, and established the Commission on Judicial Oualifications (now the Commission on Judicial Performance), the first agency in the

country to investigate complaints against judges.

"Because Gibson had been a practicing lawyer," said Mr. Witkin in praise of his colleague, "he had a sense of order and efficiency for tackling the systems of the court....He brought better equipment, more efficient methods of operation, and better staff to the court, including career law clerks in adequate numbers for all of the justices so that they could face the increasing number of cases. He turned the court into a model for all the nation."

Hon, Mildred L. Lillie, 1961-1963, 1987-1989 Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division One, Los Angeles

Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Seven, Los Angeles

**Mr. Ralph N. Kleps, 1961-1977

Administrative Director of the Courts, Secretary of the Judicial Council

Hon. Martin J. Coughlin, 1961-1963

Justice, Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, San **Bernardino**

Hon. Roy L. Herndon, 1961

Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Two, Los Angeles

Hon. Thomas Coakley, 1961

Judge, Superior Court, Mariposa County

Hon, Preston Devine, 1961

Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Hon. John Shea, 1961-1963

Judge, Superior Court, Orange County

Hon. Clarke E. Stephens, 1961-1963 Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. John D. Foley, 1961-1963

Judge, Superior Court, Santa Clara County

Hon, Edward J. Schwartz, 1961-1965 Judge, Municipal Court, San Diego County

Hon. Joseph G. Babich, 1961-1963

Judge, Municipal Court, Sacramento County

Hon. Priscilla Haynes, 1961-1963

Judge, Justice Court, San Joaquin County

Hon, Edwin J. Regan, 1961-1965 Senator, 5th District, Weaverville

Hon. George A. Willson, 1961–1967

Member of the Assembly, 52nd District, Huntington Park

Mr. Burnham Enersen, 1961-1964

Attorney at Law, San Francisco

Mr. Howard J. Finn, 1961–1963

Attorney at Law, San Francisco

Mr. DeWitt A. Higgs, 1961-1963 Attorney at Law, San Diego

Hon, Bertram D. Janes, 1962-1967 Judae, Superior Court, Plumas County

Hon. Louis H. Burke, 1963-1965, 1967-1969

Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District,

Division Four, Los Angeles

Associate Justice, Supreme Court

Hon. John B. Molinari, 1963-1967

Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division One. San Francisco

Hon, Martin Katz, 1963-1967

Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. George Mellis, 1963-1965

Judge, Superior Court, Stanislaus County

Hon, E. Scott Dales, 1963-1967

Judge, Municipal Court, Riverside County

Hon, Richard J. Swan, 1963-1967

Judge, Justice Court, Solano County

Mr. Frank B. Belcher, 1963-1965

Attorney at Law. Los Anaeles

Mr. James L. Focht, Jr., 1963-1967

Attorney at Law, San Diego

Mr. James A. Wyckoff, 1963-1967 Attorney at Law, Watsonville

Hon. Mathew O. Tobriner, 1964-1967, 1978-1979

Associate Justice, Supreme Court

Hon. Gordon L. Files, 1964-1971, 1973-1977

Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Four, Los Angeles

Hon. Thomas Kongsgaard, 1964-1969

Judge, Superior Court, Napa County

Hon, Roy Gargano, 1964-1967 Judge, Superior Court, Kern County

Hon, Claude M. Owens, 1964-1968

Judge, Municipal Court, Orange County

Mr. Leonard A. Shelton, 1964-1968

Attorney at Law, Pomona

Mr. Samuel H. Wagener, 1964-1968

Attorney at Law, Oakland

Hon. Donald L. Grunsky, 1965-1973

Senator, 23rd District 1965-1967, 17th District 1968-1973,

Watsonville

Hon. Leonard M. Ginsburg, 1966—1971

Judae, Superior Court, Tulare County

*Hon. Donald R. Wright, 1967—1968, 1970—1977 Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County Chief Justice of California, Chair of the Judicial Council

Hon. Fred R. Pierce, 1967—1971

Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District,
Sacramento

Hon. Joseph A. Rattigan, 1967—1971 Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Four, San Francisco

Hon. George A. Lazar, 1967–1971 Judge, Superior Court, San Diego County

Hon. Homer B. Thompson, 1967–1971

Judge, Superior Court, Santa Clara County

Hon. Donald B. Constine, 1967–1969, 1981–1985 Judge, Municipal Court, and Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Hon. Harold C. Shepherd, 1967—1969

Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Erich Auerbach, 1967—1971, 1981—1983 Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Russell Goodwin, 1967—1969 Judge, Municipal Court, San Bernardino County

Hon. Robert J. Duggan, 1967–1971 Judge, Justice Court, Contra Costa County

Hon. Richard C. Eldred, 1967–1971 Judge, Justice Court, Monterey County

Hon. William T. Bagley, 1967—1969 Member of the Assembly, 7th District, San Rafael

Mr. Clarence S. Hunt, 1967—1972 Attorney at Law, Long Beach

Mr. Galen McKnight, 1967–1972 Attorney at Law, Fresno

Mr. Harvey C. Miller, 1968–1973 Attorney at Law, San Jose

Hon. Raymond L. Sullivan, 1969–1973, 1975–1977 Associate Justice, Supreme Court

Hon. William H. Levit, 1969—1971 Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Mildred L. Lillie 1961-1963, 1987-1989

"I have lived through monumental economic, social, and legislative changes that have had an impact on the ...administration of justice," Justice Mildred L. Lillie recently wrote. "I have watched with pride the upsurge of women in the profession."

Considered one of the pioneers of women's participation in the judiciary, Justice Lillie entered the male-dominated legal field in 1938. Since 1958, she has served as a presiding justice in the Second Appellate District.

Justice Lillie is known for what some have called her "fierce demeanor"—she will not tolerate incivility in the courtroom. "I have been disheartened by the gradual change in

counsel's respect for each other and for the court, a growing incivility that often rises to the level of acrimony."

Nonetheless, Justice Lillie regards other changes as

inevitable and necessary. She sees the computer as a critical tool for the delivery of cost-effective legal services. She also believes that the courts, to ensure the fair and impartial administration of justice, must reinvigorate and maintain public confidence by educating citizens through ongoing outreach programs about the court's role in the community and how the judicial system works.

Hon. Jean Morony, 1969—1973 Judge, Superior Court, Butte County

Hon. James W. Cook, 1969—1973 Judge, Municipal Court, Orange County

Hon. James A. Hayes, 1969–1971

Member of the Assembly, 39th District, Long Beach

Mr. Marcus Mattson, 1969–1973 Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

Hon. Martin N. Pulich, 1970–1975

Judge, Municipal Court, San Francisco County

Hon. Gerald Brown, 1971–1975, 1981–1985 Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One, San Diego

Hon. Wakefield Taylor, 1971–1975, 1979–1983
Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District,
Division Two. San Francisco

Hon. Harold W. Schweitzer, 1971–1973

Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division

Three. Los Anaeles

Hon. Jerome H. Berenson, 1971–1975 Judge, Superior Court, Ventura County

Hon. Donald R. Franson, 1971–1973 Judge, Superior Court, Fresno County

Hon. Francis McCarty, 1971–1973

Judae, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Hon. Joseph A. Wapner, 1971–1973 Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Warren L. Ettinger, 1971–1975 Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Warren C. Conklin, 1971–1975, 1990–1991 (A)

Judge, Justice Court, and Presiding Judge, Superior Court, San

Luis Obispo County

Hon. Henry A. Willingham, 1971–1973 Judge, Justice Court, Imperial County

Hon. Charles Warren, 1972–1974

Member of the Assembly, 56th District, Los Angeles

Mr. Forrest A. Plant, 1972–1976 Attorney at Law, Sacramento

Mr. Richard R. Rogan, 1972–1976 Attorney at Law, Burbank Hon. Stanley Mosk, 1973–1975 Associate Justice, Supreme Court

Hon. Melvin E. Cohn, 1973—1977 Judge, Superior Court, San Mateo County

Hon. Warren K. Taylor, 1973—1977 Judge, Superior Court, Yolo County

Hon. R. Donald Chapman, 1973–1977 Judge, Municipal Court, Santa Clara County

Hon. Charles W. Edwards, 1973–1975 Judge, Justice Court, Fresno County

Hon. Alfred H. Song, 1973–1978 Senator, 28th District, Monterey Park

Mr. Thomas M. Jenkins, 1973—1977 Attorney at Law, San Francisco

Mr. William J. Schall, 1973—1977 Attorney at Law, La Jolla

Hon. Alfred J. McCourtney, 1974–1975 Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Bruce W. Sumner, 1974—1979 Judge, Superior Court, Orange County

Hon. John J. Miller, 1974–1978 Member of the Assembly, 13th District, Emeryville

Hon. Thomas W. Caldecott, 1975–1979
Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District,
Division Four. San Francisco

Hon. Floyd C. Dodson, 1975—1977

Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Santa Barbara County

Hon. Robert A. Wenke, 1975–1977

Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Earl J. Cantos, 1975—1979, 1982—1983 Judge, Municipal Court, San Diego County

Hon. Patricia J. Hofstetter, 1975–1979 Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. John Irwin, 1975—1977 Judge, Justice Court, Lake County

Hon. John V. Stroud, 1975–1979 *Judge, Justice Court, Sacramento County*

Hon. Wilfred J. Harpham, 1976–1979 Judge, Justice Court, Lake County Mr. Joseph W. Cotchett, 1976—1978 Attorney at Law, San Mateo

Mr. Michael di Leonardo, 1976–1978 Attorney at Law, Sunnyvale

Mr. Mark P. Robinson, 1976–1977 Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

*Hon. Rose Elizabeth Bird, 1977–1986 Chief Justice of California, Chair of the Judicial Council

Hon. Bernard S. Jefferson, 1977–1981 Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Four, Los Angeles

Hon. John A. Arguelles, 1977—1979 Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Spurgeon Avakian, 1977—1981 Judge, Superior Court, Alameda County

Hon. J. Hilary Cook, 1977—1979 Judge, Superior Court, Alpine County

Hon. William P. Hogoboom, 1977—1979

Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Charles E. Goff, 1977–1979 Judge, Municipal Court, San Francisco County

Mr. Nathaniel S. Colley, 1977—1979 Attorney at Law, Sacramento

Mr. Seth M. Hufstedler, 1977–1978 Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

**Mr. Ralph J. Gampell, 1978–1987 Administrative Director of the Courts, Secretary of the Judicial Council

Hon. Jerry Smith, 1978–1979 Senator, 12th District, San Jose

Mr. Thomas T. Anderson, 1978–1980 Attorney at Law, Indio

Mr. E. Dean Price, 1978—1980 Attorney at Law, Modesto

Mr. Edwin J. Wilson, 1978–1981 Attorney at Law, Long Beach

Hon. Wiley W. Manuel, 1979–1981 Associate Justice, Supreme Court

Ralph M. Kleps 1961-1977

Ralph N. Kleps, a nationally recognized expert in the field of court administration, became California's first Administrative Director of the Courts in 1961.

The use of information technology first proliferated in the courts during Mr. Kleps's 16-year tenure. In his 1969 address "Computers and Court Management," he drew on AOC survey statistics to find that in 1966 only 12 of California's 58 superior courts were "utilizing data processing equipment." Despite this low figure, he believed the widespread use of information technology was inevitable and welcome but was no panacea.

"None of us should be unduly optimistic about the possibility that the machines of

the future are going to solve the problems of the present," he warned. "Unless we continue to work like beavers on the problems of the present, keeping an eye on the machines of the future, they will never be able to assist us with those problems when the future arrives."

In 1991 the Judicial Council instituted the Ralph N. Kleps Awards for Improvement in the Administration of the Courts to honor the contributions made by individual courts to improving access to a fair and impartial judicial system.

Hon. Stephen K. Tamura, 1979-1981

Justice, Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division

Two, San Bernardino

Hon. Richard W. Abbe, 1979—1983 Judge, Superior Court, Shasta County

Hon. Harry W. Low, 1979-1981

Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Hon. Richard Schauer, 1979–1981

Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Vaino H. Spencer, 1979–1983

Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Ann Marie Chargin, 1979–1983

Judge, Municipal Court, San Joaquin County

Hon. Armond M. Jewell, 1979–1981

Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Lewis Wenzell, 1979-1981

Judge, Municipal Court, San Diego County

Hon. Rick S. Brown, 1979-1983

Judge, Justice Court, Santa Barbara County

Hon. Vivian Ouinn, 1979-1983

Judge, Justice Court, Tuolumne County

Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division One, Los Angeles

Hon. Bob Wilson, 1979–1981

Senator, 39th District, San Diego

Hon. Jack R. Fenton, 1979–1980

Member of the Assembly, 59th District, Montebello

Mr. Gregory Munoz, 1979–1981 Attornev at Law. Santa Ana

Hon. Florence Bernstein, 1980–1987

Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Mr. Joseph G. Hurley, 1980–1984

Attorney at Law, North Hollywood

Ms. Susan Yvonne Illston, 1980—1982, 1993—1994 Attorney at Law, San Mateo and Burlingame

Hon. Allen E. Broussard, 1981–1987 Associate Justice, Supreme Court

Hon. Sidney Feinberg, 1981-1985

Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Three, San Francisco Hon. Richard Hodge, 1981—1983

Judge, Superior Court, Alameda County

Hon. Richard Ibanez, 1981–1983

Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Harold Ellis Shabo, 1981—1983

Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Omer L. Rains, 1981-1983

Senator, 18th District, Santa Barbara/Ventura

Hon. Elihu M. Harris, 1981-1989

Member of the Assembly, 13th District, Oakland

Mr. Peter J. Hughes, 1981–1983 Attorney at Law, San Diego

Mr. Clayton R. Janssen, 1981–1983

Attorney at Law, Eureka

Mr. W. Robert Morgan, 1982–1984 Attornev at Law. San Jose

Attorney at Law, San Jose

Hon. Elwood Lui, 1983-1987

Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division

Three, Los Angeles

Hon. Mario G. Olmos, 1983–1987

Judge, Superior Court, Fresno County

Hon. Harry V. Peetris, 1983—1985 Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Gerald E. Ragan, 1983—1987 *Judge, Superior Court, San Mateo County*

Hon. Frances Munoz, 1983—1987 *Judge, Municipal Court, Orange County*

Hon. Michael Anthony Tynan, 1983—1985 Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Earl Warren, Jr., 1983—1987 Judge, Municipal Court, Sacramento County

Hon. Raymond E. Schaal, 1983—1985 Judge, Justice Court, Lake County

Hon. Mikio Uchiyama, 1983—1987 Judge, Justice Court, Fresno County

Hon. Barry Keene, 1983—1985

Senator, 2nd District, Santa Barbara/Ventura

Mr. Kevin W. Midlam, 1983—1987 Attorney at Law, San Diego Mr. Robert D. Raven, 1983–1987 Attorney at Law, San Francisco

Hon. Thomas F. Crosby, Jr., 1984–1985

Justice, Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division

Three. Santa Ana

Mr. Gert K. Hirschberg, 1984–1986 Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

Hon. Arleigh M. Woods, 1985–1987Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District,Division Four, Los Angeles

Hon. Pauline D. Hanson, 1985—1987 *Justice, Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District, Fresno*

Hon. Barnet M. Cooperman, 1985–1987 Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Leslie C. Nichols, 1985–1987 Judge, Superior Court, Santa Clara County

Hon. Maxine F.Thomas, 1985—1987 Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Brian L. Rix, 1985—1987 *Judge, Justice Court, Butte County*

Hon. Bill Lockyer, 1985–1993 Senator, 10th District, Alameda

Mr. Anthony Murray, 1985–1986 Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

Mr. David B. Baum, 1986–1988 Attorney at Law, San Francisco

Mr. Joseph H. Cummins, 1986—1988 Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

*Hon. Malcolm M. Lucas, 1987—1996 Chief Justice of California. Chair of the Judicial Council

Hon. David N. Eagleson, 1987—1989 Associate Justice, Supreme Court

Hon. Robert K. Puglia, 1987–1989
Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District,
Sacramento

Hon. Donald B. King, 1987—1989 Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Five, San Francisco

Hon. Jack E. Goertzen, 1987—1988

Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Rose Elizabeth Bird 1977-1986

In her first address as Chief Justice, Rose Elizabeth Bird warned that the judicial system was becoming "more and more removed" from the people whose rights and interests it was supposed to protect.

Chief Justice Bird, the first woman appointed to the California Supreme Court and the first woman Chief Justice, instituted several reforms to engender a public "sense of participation" in the judicial process. She appointed special panels to solicit public comment on such problems as court congestion, promoted televised and photographic coverage of court proceedings at the trial and appellate court levels, and pushed several new statutes and court rules

to expedite the disposition of civil cases. Chief Justice Bird made unprecedented appointments of women and minority judges to the Judicial Council, where she also encouraged extensive use of advisory committees composed of not only judges and lawyers but also educators, journalists, and other members of the public.

Although her rulings made her unpopular with many Californians, several of the reforms Chief Justice Bird proposed and sponsored—such as the landmark State Funding of Trial Courts Act of 1985—were enacted after her tenure.

Hon. Harmon G. Scoville, 1987—1988
Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Orange County

Hon. Fern M. Smith, 1987—1988 Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Hon. William D. Stein, 1987–1988 Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Hon. Ricardo A. Torres, 1987—1989, 1991—1993 Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Lourdes Gillespie Baird, 1987—1988 Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Robert D. Mackey, 1987–1989 Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Cerena Wong, 1987—1989 Judge, Municipal Court, Sonoma County

Hon. Robert A. Barclay, 1987—1992 Judge, Justice Court, Modoc County

Hon. Jane A. York, 1987—1989 Judge, Justice Court, Fresno County

Mr. David M. Heilbron, 1987–1989 Attorney at Law, San Francisco

Mr. Kenneth W. Larson, 1987–1991 Attorney at Law, San Pablo

**Mr. William E. Davis, 1988—1991
Administrative Director of the Courts, Secretary of the Judicial Council

Hon. Cecily Bond, 1988–1991

Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Sacramento County

Hon. Richard P. Byrne, 1988—1991
Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Henry Ramsey, Jr., 1988–1991 Judge, Superior Court, Alameda County

Hon. Roy L. Wonder, 1988–1992 Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Hon. Susan P. Finlay, 1988—1991 Judge, Municipal Court, San Diego County

Mr. Peter J. Hinton, 1988–1990 Attorney at Law, Walnut Creek

Mr. Don W. Martens, 1988–1990 Attorney at Law, Newport Beach Hon. Edward A. Panelli, 1989–1992 Associate Justice, Supreme Court

Hon. Betty Barry-Deal, 1989–1990

Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Three,

San Francisco

Hon. William L. Todd, Jr., 1989–1991 Justice, Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One. Fresno

Hon. Kathryne A. Stoltz, 1989—1991 Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Rudolph R. Loncke, 1989–1991 Judge, Municipal Court, Sacramento County

Hon. B. Tam Nomoto, 1989—1991 Judge, Municipal Court, Orange County

Hon. Douglas V. Mewhinney, 1989–1991

Judge, Justice Court, Calaveras County

Mr. Johnnie L. Cochran, Jr., 1989–1991 Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

*Hon. Ronald M. George, 1990–1991, 1993– Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Four, Los Angeles Associate Justice, Supreme Court

Chief Justice of California, Chair of the Judicial Council

Hon. Patricia Bamattre-Manoukian, 1990–1993, 1993–1995

Justice, Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District, San Jose

Hon. Phil Isenberg, 1990—1995 Member of the Assembly, 10th District, Sacramento

Mr. Kevin R. Culhane, 1990–1992 Attorney at Law, Sacramento

Ms. Louise A. La Mothe, 1990—1991 Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

Hon. John C. Woolley, 1990—1991 (A) California Judges Association Judge, Superior Court, Orange County

Hon. Kevil "Chip" Martin, 1990–1991 (A)
Commissioner, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Mr. Ken Torre, 1990–1991 (A)
Executive Officer, Superior Court, San Mateo County

Mr. Howard Hanson, 1990-1996 (A) County Clerk/Court Administrator, Superior Court, Marin County

Ms. Kathy Newman, 1990-1991 (A) Deputy Clerk, Municipal Court, Alameda County

Mr. Kevin A. Swanson, 1990-1992 (A) Clerk of the Court, Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District, Fresno

Mr. Bernard E. Witkin, 1990-1995 (A) Attorney at Law, Berkeley

Hon, Hollis G. Best, 1991-1993 Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District, Fresno

Hon, Daniel J. Kremer, 1991-1994 Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One, San Bernardino

Hon. Judith McConnell, 1991-1994 Judge, Superior Court, San Diego County

Hon. Joanne C. Parrilli, 1991-1993, 1993-1995 Judge, Superior Court, Alameda County

Hon. Nancy L. Sweet, 1991–1992 Judge, Municipal Court, Sacramento County

Hon. Judith Donna Ford, 1991-1993, 1993-1995 Judge, Municipal Court, Alameda County

Hon, Richard A. Paez, 1991-1994 Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Anthony W. Ishii, 1991-1993, 1993-1995 Judge, Justice Court, Fresno County

Ms. Patricia Phillips, 1991–1992 Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

Mr. Alan I. Rothenberg, 1991–1992 Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

Hon. Patrick J. Morris, 1991-1993, 1993-1994 (A) California Judges Association Judge, Superior Court, San Bernardino County

Hon, Michael S. Ullman, 1991 (A) California Judaes Association Judge, Municipal Court, Sacramento County

Malcolm M. Lucas 1987-1996

Malcolm M. Lucas was appointed Chief Justice following an unprecedented rejection of three sitting Supreme Court justices by the electorate in 1986. He took over a divided court that was the subject of much criticism.

"The more unified our voice, the more effective we will be." Chief Justice Lucas said as he set about bringing order and efficiency to a judicial system challenged by underfunding and overload. He led the courts through the implementation of the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act, advocated for state funding of all the state's courts, and restructured the Judicial Council to make it increasingly assume the role of central

planner and advocate for the courts. Along with revitalizing the Judicial Council, he renewed interaction and cooperation

between the judiciary and the Legislature to solve financial and structural problems. To prepare the courts for the challenges of the future, he organized and chaired the Conference on the State of the California Judiciary in the Year 2020.

"I hope I have left the system a better place than when I entered it," Chief Justice Lucas said in his 1995 State of the Judiciary address. "I hope each of you will aspire to do the same."

Mr. Martin J. Moshier, 1991 (A)
Association for Superior Court Administration
County Clerk/Executive Officer, Superior Court, San
Bernardino County

Mr. Christopher Crawford, 1991–1992 (A) Association of Municipal Court Clerks Court Administrator, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

**Mr. Robert W. Page, Jr., 1992
Acting Administrative Director of the Courts, Secretary of the Indicial Council

**Mr. William C. Vickrey, 1992— Administrative Director of the Courts, Secretary of the Judicial Council

Hon. Sandra Ann Thompson, 1992—1993 Judge, Municipal Court, San Diego County

Mr. William McCurine, Jr., 1992–1994 Attorney at Law, San Diego

Hon. Ralph Flageollet, 1992 (A)

California Court Commissioners Association

Commissioner, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Mr. Dennis B. Jones, 1992 (A)
Association of Municipal Court Clerks of California
Clerk/Administrator, Municipal Court, Sacramento County

Hon. James A. Ardiaz, 1993—1996 Justice, Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District, Fresno

Hon. Philip A. Champlin, 1993—1994 Judge, Superior Court, Napa County

Hon. Robert M. Mallano, 1993–1996
Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Kathleen E. O'Leary, 1993—1996 Judge, Superior Court, Orange County

Hon. Steven J. Howell, 1993–1996 Presiding Judge, Municipal Court, Butte County

Hon. Michael S. Goodman, 1993–1994

California Court Commissioners Association

Commissioner, Municipal Court, San Diego County

Hon. Edward Forstenzer, 1993—1996 Judge, Justice Court, Mono County

Mr. Michael A. Tozzi, 1993–1994 (A)
Association for Superior Court Administration
Court Executive Officer/Clerk of Court, Superior Court,
Stanislaus County

Mr. Earl S. Bradley, 1993–1994 (A) Association of Municipal Court Clerks Court Administrator, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Mr. Stephen Kelly, 1993–1994 (A)
Appellate Court Clerks Association
Clerk, Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District,
San Bernardino

Hon. Arthur G. Scotland, 1994–1999

Justice, Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Sacramento

Hon. Roger K. Warren, 1994–1996 *Judge, Superior and Municipal Courts, Sacramento County*

Hon. Rise Jones Pichon, 1994–1999 *Judge, Municipal Court, Santa Clara County*

Hon. Martin C. Suits, 1994

Judge, Justice Court, Kings County

Hon. Charles Calderon, 1994—1997 Senator, 30th District, Montebello

Mr. Harvey I. Saferstein, 1994–1997 Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

Mr. Brian C. Walsh, 1994—1998 Attorney at Law, San Jose

Hon. Eugene Mac Amos, Jr., 1994 (A)

California Judges Association

Judge, Municipal Court, San Diego County

Hon. Roger W. Boren, 1995–1998
Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District,
Division Two, Los Angeles

Hon. Lois Haight, 1995—1998

Judge, Superior Court, Contra Costa County

Hon. Kathryn Doi Todd, 1995—1998 Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Jon M. Mayeda, 1995—1997 Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Eleanor Provost, 1995—1998 Judge, Municipal Court, Tuolumne County

Mr. Dallas Holmes, 1995—1997 Attornev at Law. Riverside

Ms. Glenda Veasey, 1995–1999 Attorney at Law, El Segundo Hon. Rudolph A. Diaz, 1995 (A) California Judaes Association Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Robert Schleh, 1995-1996 (A) California Court Commissioners Association Commissioner, Superior and Municipal Courts, Sacramento County

Ms. Sharon A. Gonterman, 1995–1996 (A) Association of Municipal Court Clerks Court Administrator, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Mr. Ronald Overholt, 1995-1998 (A) Association for Superior Court Administration Executive Officer/Clerk, Superior Court, Alameda County

Mr. Michael Yerly, 1995-1996 (A) Appellate Court Clerks Association Clerk, Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District, San Jose

Hon. Marvin R. Baxter, 1996-Associate Justice, Supreme Court

Hon. J. Richard Couzens, 1996–2000 Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Placer County Hon, Melinda Johnson, 1996–2000 Judge, Superior Court, Ventura County

Hon. Albert Dover, 1996-1999 Presiding Judge, Municipal Court, Nevada County

Hon. Brenda Harbin-Forte, 1996-1999 Judge, Municipal Court, Alameda County

Hon. Bill Morrow, 1996 Member of the Assembly, 73rd District, Oceanside

Hon. Paul Boland, 1996-2000 (A) California Judaes Association Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. William F. McDonald, 1996-1997 (A) California Judges Association Judge, Superior Court, Orange County

Hon. Nori Anne Walla, 1996–1998 (A) Commissioner, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Ms. Sheila Gonzalez, 1996-1999 (A) Executive Officer, Superior and Municipal Courts, Ventura County

Bernard E. Witkin 1990-1995

Bernard F. Witkin's summaries of California law—the eight-foot-long shelfful of books generally known as "Witkin"—have been cited in published state and federal appellate opinions an estimated 100,000 times.

"Witkin" had its genesis in the 1920s, when the brilliant University of California at Berkeley student, who hated studying law by the Socratic method so much that he failed his family law class through poor attendance, began selling his bar review study outlines. The Summary of California Law was begun at a time when California law was far less complex and voluminous. Growing with the field, it became Bernard E. Witkin's life work.

He first served the Judicial Council in 1939, after Chief Justice Phil S. Gibson convinced the Governor and Legislature that the council

should be granted the authority and staff particularly the indefatigable Mr. Witkinto write the California court rules. Mr. Witkin, with the titular guidance of a 100-member advisory committee, drafted the state's first rules on appeal. He was also instrumental in the development of California's Judicial Education Center.

Although he never became a judge or argued a case in court, it has been said that no case is argued in California without him. Hon. Richard D. Huffman, 1996-

Justice, Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One, San Diego

Mr. Joseph A. Lane, 1996-1999 (A)

Clerk, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Los Angeles

Mr. Stephen V. Love, 1996-2000 (A)

County Clerk/Executive Officer, Superior Court, Santa Clara County

Hon. Carol A. Corrigan, 1997-2001

Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Three, San Francisco

Hon. Benjamin Aranda, 1997—1998 Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Michael B. Orfield, 1997—1999 Judge, Municipal Court, San Diego County

Hon. Martha M. Escutia, 1997—1998, 2000— Member of the Assembly, 50th District, Montebello Senator, 30th District, Montebello

Mr. Sheldon Sloan, 1997–2000 Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

Hon. Dwayne Keyes, 1997—1998 (A) *California Judges Association Judge, Superior Court, Fresno County*

Hon. Richard D. Aldrich, 1998-

Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, Los Anaeles

Hon. James A. Bascue, 1998—2000 Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Steven E. Jahr, 1998–2001

Judge, Superior Court, Shasta County

Hon. Sheila Kuehl, 1998-2000

Member of the Assembly, 41st District, Santa Monica

Hon. Ana Maria Luna, 1998–2001 Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Ronald L. Taylor, 1998 (A), 1999–2001 Judge, Superior Court, Riverside County

Hon. David L. Haet, 1998–2000

Commissioner, Superior Court, Solano County

Mr. Michael Case, 1998–2001 Attorney at Law, Ventura Hon. William M. Wunderlich, 1998-1999 (A)

California Judges Association

Justice, Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District, San Jose

Mr. Frederick Ohlrich, 1998-2001 (A)

Court Administrator, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County Executive Officer, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Clerk of the Supreme Court

Hon. Leonard P. Edwards, 1999— Judge, Superior Court, Santa Clara County

Hon. Donna J. Hitchens, 1999-

Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Hon. Ronald B. Robie, 1999-

Judge, Superior Court, Sacramento County

Ms. Pauline W. Gee, 1999-

Deputy Attorney General, Attorney General's Office, Sacramento

Mr. John J. Collins, 1999— Attorney at Law, Newport Beach

Hon. David J. Danielsen, 1999–2000 (A) California Judges Association Judge, Superior Court, San Diego County

Mr. Arthur Sims, 1999— (A)

Executive Officer, Superior Court, Riverside County and Alameda County

Mr. Ron D. Barrow, 1999-2000 (A)

Clerk, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, San Francisco

Hon. Gail A. Andler, 2000-

Judge, Superior Court, Orange County

Hon, Aviva K, Bobb, 2000-

Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Brad R. Hill, 2000-

Judge, Superior Court, Fresno County

Hon. Ronald M. Sabraw, 2000—
Judge, Superior Court, Alameda County

Hon. Darrell Steinberg, 2000-

Member of the Assembly, 9th District, Sacramento

Mr. Rex Heeseman, 2000— Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

Hon. William C. Harrison, 2000-2001 (A), 2001-

California Judges Association

Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Solano County

Hon. Wayne L. Peterson, 2000— (A)

Presiding Judge, Superior Court, San Diego County

Hon. Bobby R. Vincent, 2000— (A)

Commissioner, Superior Court, San Bernardino County

Mr. Alan Slater, 2000— (A)
Executive Officer, Superior Court, Orange County

Hon. Robert A. Dukes, 2001— Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Norman L. Epstein, 2001— Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Four, Los Angeles

Hon. Barbara Ann Zúñiga, 2001— Judge, Superior Court, Contra Costa County

Mr. Thomas J. Warwick, Jr., 2001— Attorney at Law, San Diego

Hon. Stephen D. Bradbury, 2001— (A)
California Judges Association
Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Lassen County

Ms. Christine Patton, 2001— (A)
Executive Officer, Superior Court, Santa Cruz County

^{* =} Chief Justice

^{** =} Administrative Director

⁽A) = Advisory Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF SENATE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT No. 15, NOVEMBER 2, 1926

The purpose of this amendment is to organize the courts of the state on a business basis. The "judicial council" which the amendment creates is not a commission, but will be composed of judges in office. The Chief Justice of the state and ten other judges chosen by him from the trial and appellate courts will meet from time to time as a sort of board of directors, and will be charged with the duty of seeing that justice is being properly administered. No new office is created: the Chief Justice will act as chairman of the council and the Clerk of the Supreme Court will act as its secretary.

One of the troubles with our court system is that the work of the various courts is not unrelated, and nobody is responsible for seeing that the machinery of the courts is working smoothly. When it is discovered that some rule of procedure is not working well, it is nobody's business to see that the evil is corrected. But with a judicial council, whenever anything goes wrong, any judge or lawyer or litigant or other citizen will know to whom to make complaint, and it will be the duty of the council to propose a remedy, and if this cannot be done without an amendment to the laws the council will recommend to the legislature any change in the law which it deems necessary.

Similar judicial councils have recently been created in Oregon, Ohio, North Carolina, and Massachusetts. The Chief Justice will fill the position that a general superintendent fills in any business. He will be the real as well as the nominal head of the judiciary of the state, and will have the power of transferring judges from courts that are not busy to those that are. This will make it unnecessary to have judges "tempore," or temporary judges, as now provided in the constitution.

The amendment also provides for a presiding judge of the superior court in every county where there are more than two judges. The constitution now provides for such a presiding judge only in San Francisco. Obsolete and unnecessary matter now appearing in section six is eliminated. The election of judges of the superior court for a "short term," which is sometimes only a few weeks between election day and the following January, is done away with, and whenever a vacancy occurs prior to April first of an election year a judge will be elected at the general election to hold office for the full term of six years. If a vacancy occurs after April first of an election year, the time is too short to circulate petitions and satisfactorily prepare for an election at the August primary, and in such a case the governor will make an appointment to fill the vacancy until the next election year.

This amendment will aid greatly in simplifying and improving the administration of justice.

M. R. Johnson, State Senator, Eleventh District.
J. M. Inman, State Senator, Seventh District.





Profile: Judicial Council of California
Published by the
Administrative Office of the Courts
Office of Communications
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660
415-865-7740
Publications Hotline: 800-900-5980
www.courtinfo.ca.gov